



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|

10/599,263

09/25/2006

Nalliah Raman

NL 040298

6364

24737

7590

08/20/2009

PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS

P.O. BOX 3001

BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER

BOYD, JONATHAN A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2629

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

08/20/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. 10/599,263 | Applicant(s) RAMAN ET AL. | |
| | Examiner JONATHAN BOYD | Art Unit 2629 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 September 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 and 10-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 5-9 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 15 June 2008 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>9/25/2007</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to application number 10/599,263 filed September 25th 2006. Claims 1-17 are currently pending and have been examined.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. Acknowledgment is made of Applicant's Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) Form PTO-1449 filed on September 25th 2007. The IDS has been considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-2, 10, 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Park (2002/0130830).

In regards to claims 1 and 15, Park teaches a display device comprising an adjustable light source (*See; Fig. 1, element 120*); a display panel with display pixels for modulating light originating from the light source (*See; Fig. 1, element 110 and p[0023]–p[0024]*); and processing circuitry coupled to the display panel and the light source (*See; Fig. 1, element 200 and p[0026]–p[0028]*), the processing circuitry having an input for receiving an input signal representing gray levels of pixels of an image to be

Art Unit: 2629

displayed on the display panel (*See; Fig. 1, where inputs RGB connect to data counter 210 and p[0029]*) and comprising: means for selecting a dimmed brightness level of the light source in dependence on the gray levels of the image pixels (*See Fig. 3, steps x10 and p[0030]-p[0035] where the number of low and high gray levels are counted for the purpose of having an action on the luminance*), and means for adapting the input signal in dependence on the dimmed brightness level (*See; Fig. 3, steps x20 and p[0036] for data conversion*).

In regards to claim 2, Park teaches the means for selecting being adapted to select the dimmed brightness level in dependence on a number of occurrences of a gray level corresponding to a brightness level of display pixels below a predetermined brightness level (*See; Fig. 2 where the backlight brightness is adjusted (dimmed) depending on a number of grey levels below the predetermined level of 32/64*).

In regards to claim 3, Park inherently teaches the means for selecting being adapted to substantially minimize an error function including one or more weighted numbers of occurrences formed by multiplying each of the one or more numbers of occurrences by a weighting factor (*Inherently taught in the situation of the weighting factor equaling zero, thus the weighted numbers would also equal zero*).

In regards to claim 4, Park inherently teaches the error function being formed by an addition of the one or more weighted numbers of occurrences (*Inherently taught in*

Art Unit: 2629

the situation of the weighting factor equaling zero, thus the weighted numbers would also equal zero and would further result in the error function equaling zero).

In regards to claim 10, Park teaches the predetermined brightness level being formed by the maximum contrast ratio of the display panel and the dimmed brightness level (*See; Fig. 2 and Fig. 3*).

In regards to claim 11, Park inherently teaches the input signal comprising color components of the image (*See; Fig. 1, RGB input*), a component error function being determined for each of the color components, the error function being formed by adding the component error functions (*Inherently taught in the situation of the weighting factor equaling zero, thus the weighted numbers would also equal zero and would further result in the error function equaling zero*).

In regards to claim 16, Park teaches signal processing circuitry for providing the input signal (*See; Fig. 1, element 900*).

In regards to claim 17, Park teaches an integrated circuit having: an input for receiving an input signal representing gray levels of pixels of an image to be displayed on a display panel of a display device (*See; Fig. 1, where inputs RGB connect to data counter 210 and p[0029]*), the display device comprising an adjustable light source (*See; Fig. 1, backlight 120*), the display panel having display pixels for modulating light

Art Unit: 2629

originating from the light source (*See; Fig. 1, LC display panel 110*); outputs for coupling to the display panel and the light source (*See; Fig. 1*); means for selecting a dimmed brightness level of the light source in dependence on the gray levels of the image pixels (*See Fig. 3, steps x10 and p[0030]-p[0035] where the number of low and high gray levels are counted for the purpose of having an action on the luminance*); and means for adapting the input signal in dependence on the dimmed brightness level (*See; Fig. 3, steps x20 and p[0036] for data conversion*)..

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

7. Claims 12-14 rejected are under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Park (2002/0130830) in view of Usul et al (EP 0513551) (herein "Usul").

Art Unit: 2629

In regards to claim 12, Usul teaches the processing circuitry further comprising means for determining a smoothed dimmed brightness level for an image in dependence on the dimmed brightness level of the image and a previous smoothed dimmed brightness level of a previous image, wherein n is a sequence number of successive images (*See; Abstract where the new brightness level is adjusted in accordance with the previous level*).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Park and Usul's brightness adjustment using previous levels because using the information of previous images is a known technique used for a plurality of reasons, including motion estimation, response time improvement and error calculation.

In regards to claim 13, Usul inherently teaches the smoothing having a faster response time to an increasing dimmed brightness level of subsequent images than to a decreasing dimmed brightness level of subsequent images (*When confronted with the problem of increasing the response time for implementing a new dimmed brightness level, it would have been obvious to reduce the counterbalancing effect of previous dimmed brightness levels to increase response time*).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Park and Usul's brightness adjustment using previous levels because using the information of previous images is a known technique used for a plurality of reasons, including motion estimation, response time improvement and error

Art Unit: 2629

calculation.

In regards to claim 14, Park inherently teaches wherein the means for selecting a dimmed brightness level are further adapted to select the dimmed brightness level in dependence on a content of a part of the image (*When confronted with the problem of not distorting the image processing due to external effects, it would have been obvious to process only the useful portion of the image to save processing time*).

Allowable Subject Matter

8. Claims 5-9 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 5 differs from the disclosure of Park in that, no error optimization with regards to the upper and/or lower gray levels are performed. When confronted with the problem of displaying the maximum number of gray levels of the input image, Park teaches increasing the number of possible brightness levels as referred to in Fig. 3. Thus it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to calculate the dimmed brightness level according to a function minimizing the number of gray levels that will not be displayed.

Claims 6-9 depend directly or indirectly from claim 5 and thus are allowable for all the same reasons.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

Yoshida (2005/0017990) for an adjustable backlight.

Sakashita (2002/0021292) for a display with adjustable backlight

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JONATHAN BOYD whose telephone number is (571)270-7503. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Thur 6:00 - 4:00 est.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Amr Awad can be reached on 571-272-7764. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/599,263

Page 9

Art Unit: 2629

/J. B./

Examiner, Art Unit 2629

/Amr Awad/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2629